REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 40-59 were pending in the application, of which Claims 40 and 50 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated April 5, 2006, Claims 40-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 40-59 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I.   Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated April 5, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 40, 45-48, 50, and 55-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,361,361 ("*Hickman*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,380,957 ("*Banning*"). Claims 40 and 50 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 15, lines 17-20 and page 16, lines 7-18.

Amended Claim 40 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "the unified taxonomy structure being common to and inclusive of the help topics provided by the different vendors and a first level of categories and a second level of categories in the unified taxonomy structure being predefined, static, and used by all the different vendors of software and hardware components installed on the computer." Furthermore, amended Claim 50 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "the mapping data stored in a mapping data file including an action field configurable to

include data to indicate whether the contents or mapping of the topics are to be one of the following: added, removed, and updated."

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *Hickman* at least does not teach or suggest a static first level of categories within the unified taxonomy structure. (*See* Office Action, page 6, 7-10.) Consequently, *Hickman* does not teach or suggest a static first level of categories and a static second level of categories in a unified taxonomy structure that is predefined and used by all different vendors of software and hardware components installed on a computer. Furthermore, *Hickman* is completely silent regarding mapping data stored in a mapping data file including an action field configurable to include data to indicate whether the contents or mapping of the topics are to be added, removed, or updated.

Furthermore, *Banning* does not overcome *Hickman's* deficiencies. *Banning* merely discloses that a typical GUI may display a directory tree 10 within a pane 12 of a larger window area 14. (*See* col. 1, lines 60-62, FIGs. 1A-1D.) In *Banning*, pane 12 is on the left side of window 14, while the right side contains another pane 16 which is used to display logical file system objects that reside in a particular device or directory that has been selected in pane 12. (*See* col. 1, lines 62-65, FIGs. 1A-1D.) In *Banning*, however, neither pane 12 nor pane 14 discloses a first level of categories, much less a first and second level of categories. Consequently, like *Hickman*, *Banning* at least does not teach or suggest a static first level of categories in a unified taxonomy structure that is predefined and used by all different vendors of software and hardware components installed on a computer. Furthermore, *Banning* is completely silent regarding mapping data stored in a mapping data file including an action field configurable to include data

to indicate whether the contents or mapping of the topics are to be added, removed, or updated.

Combining *Hickman* with *Banning* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Hickman* and *Banning,* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "the unified taxonomy structure being common to and inclusive of the help topics provided by the different vendors and a first level of categories and a second level of categories in the unified taxonomy structure being predefined, static, and used by all the different vendors of software and hardware components installed on the computer", as recited by amended Claim 40. Furthermore, combining *Hickman* with *Banning* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Hickman* and *Banning,* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "the mapping data stored in a mapping data file including an action field configurable to include data to indicate whether the contents or mapping of the topics are to be one of the following: added, removed, and updated", as recited by amended Claim 50. Accordingly, independent Claims 40 and 50 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 40 and 50.

Dependent Claims 41-49 and 51-59 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 40 and 50, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 40 and 50. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 41-49 and 51-59.

II.   Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final

-12-

Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 3, 2006   By:

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK·OFFICE

DKS:mdc